

Listen to this—I hope my colleagues realize this. For the really successful entrepreneur, we are increasing their marginal rates by about 42 percent because we are taking the rate from 31 percent to 44.5 percent. That is a tremendous increase.

That is not just soaking the rich. That is shooting them between the eyes. That is going to put people out of work.

For people to stand on the floor of the Senate and say this does not hurt small business—it does.

There are a lot of small businesses that are taxed as individuals that have income above \$140,000 or above \$200,000. And those are the people that are hiring people. Seventy or 80, maybe 90 percent of the new jobs created were in this category, they were in the successful small business.

And we are going to cost jobs.

Then to say—and I heard President Clinton say this last night on Larry King. He said, "Well, we really don't hurt the middle-income people. We do not touch them."

That is, frankly, not the case. The facts are there is a gasoline tax that is in the Senate bill. He said, "Well, that's only \$1 a week." In my family it is a whole lot more than \$1 a week. I have a 21-year-old daughter, I have a 17-year-old daughter, my wife, and I. Altogether that is four drivers in our family. That is a lot more than a \$50 tax increase for our family, and I am sure it is for a lot of families that live out in the rural areas. But he did not mention there is a big tax increase on Social Security recipients who have income above \$32,000. That is middle income.

Then he said people who make less than \$30,000 are held harmless. That is not the case, because many of those people are not going to receive earned

income tax credit. That is flat not the case. Many of those people are not going to receive increases in food stamps to cushion the blow on the regressive nature of the gasoline taxes. So I can think of lots of people who make less than \$30,000, including my daughter who makes \$4.75 an hour to pay for gasoline in her car and maintenance and so forth. She is not going to get earned income tax credits. So it is going to cost her. It is going to cost a lot of people.

My father-in-law, who is retired, who has Social Security and has other income in the \$30,000-some range, get to pay another \$100 a month in Social Security taxes. President Clinton evidently forgot about him last night. But there is a big tax on Social Security recipients that is in this package.

Sock it to the wealthy, he says. But is going to put people out of work. He says he is a friend of small business, but we are going to mandate parental leave, we are going to mandate health care.

There is a report done by the Heritage Foundation that says if a new payroll tax were to fund the Clinton program only for all workers and their dependents, the payroll tax would have to be set at 9.48 percent. A new payroll tax of almost 9.5 percent on all employers, small and large? Congratulations, small business people. This administration is your friend. I read that in his book, "Putting People First." But, frankly, we are putting small business last. Successful small business people are going to pay the highest marginal rates of anyone.

So, my point is this tax bill and this tax conference leaves a lot to be desired. I think it is a prescription, not for deficit reduction, it is a prescription, frankly, to put people out of work.

Then I would like to comment finally on the components of this package because, again, I have heard President Clinton last night who said it is a \$500 billion deficit-reduction package. He also said he expects his spending cuts would exceed the tax increases. Frankly, this is not the case. Neither is the case. It is not a \$500 billion deficit-reduction package. He is taking credit for \$44 billion that is already in present law. That was part of the 1990 budget package. How can you take credit for something that is already part of law? That is \$44 billion. He takes credit for interest savings, and that is not anything that is done in this bill. That is a wish.

If we look, he takes credit for spending reductions in appropriations bills, two-thirds of which do not happen until after the next Presidential election. I might mention most of that is in defense, and many of us think he is current defense far too much and too fast. But the net result is you are looking at tax increases that are not 1 to 1, or spending cuts as large as the tax increases. If you call tax increases and user fees tax increases, which they are, and you eliminate the interest savings, you realize that the total ratio of tax increases versus spending cuts is \$2.82 in tax increases for every \$1 of spending cuts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD, which will show the amount of savings from appropriations, from reconciliation, from user fees, and revenues, so individuals can find out the bulk of this package is clearly a tax increase and not a spending cut.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE BUDGET PACKAGE RATIOS

(House-passed bill, in billions of dollars)

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1994-98
Spending reductions:						
Appropriations	-0.3	0.9	-7.5	-22.4	-37.3	-66.6
Reconciliation	-1.8	-4.8	-9.3	-14.3	-16.9	-47.0
Other ¹	3.2	1.4	1.7	2.1	2.3	10.7
Subtotal	1.1	-2.5	-15.1	-34.6	-51.9	-102.9
User fees	2.2	7.4	3.7	3.1	3.2	14.6
Revenue increases	32.7	41.6	54.8	73.8	77.6	275.5
Subtotal	34.9	44.0	58.4	76.8	75.9	290.1
Debt management	-5	-1.0	-1.3	-1.6	-2.0	-6.4
Debt service	-1.1	-3.6	-7.5	-13.8	-22.1	-48.1
Subtotal	-1.6	-4.6	-8.8	-15.4	-24.1	-54.5
Grand Total	-35.4	-52.1	-67.4	-126.8	-151.2	-447.5
Ratio of taxes and user fees to spending reductions	NA	\$17.66 to \$1	\$3.86 to \$1	\$2.22 to \$1	\$1.46 to \$1	\$2.82 to \$1

¹ Assumes \$3.2 billion in intragovernmental offsets from the Federal pay freeze in the House-passed bill; and \$2.3 billion associated with the enactment of extended unemployment benefits.

Note.—Based on CBO/ICE estimates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma yields the floor. Under the previous order the Senator from South Carolina is recognized for up to 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS].

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, responding to the comments made by my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, there has been a constant babble—and I say again "babble"—about an alleged 2-for-1 or 3-for-1 ratio of tax increases to spending cuts in the Presi-

dent's deficit-reduction plan. The Senator from Oregon, the ranking member of the Finance Committee and former chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator PACKWOOD, said there is \$3.50 in taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts. Others say \$2.82 in taxes for every \$1 in cuts. This is a crude distortion of the

facts. I want to give the exact figure, which is that there is less than \$1 in taxes for each \$1 in spending cuts.

In the current 1993 budget, discretionary spending—namely, defense, domestic and international affairs, totals \$548 billion. In President Clinton's proposed 1994 budget, total discretionary spending is reduced to \$538 billion; that amounts to an absolute reduction of \$10 billion in discretionary spending.

President Clinton is being accused of tax and spend, but in fact the gentleman from Arkansas has not had a chance to spend. He just got to town. The small exception is the modest supplemental bill, most of which was financed through offsets. There was \$1 billion in that bill for defense and peacekeeping that was not offset. But most of it was, of course, offset.

So the distinguished President of the United States has not had any opportunity to spend. He just got to town. But he has had the fortitude, please-by-gracious, to tackle this deficit head on. He has offered a historic plan. But this crowd on the other side of the aisle want to distract us with nonsense: "What Hillary Clinton's pay schedule is on her income tax and how much the President's BVD's are worth."

That is what drew me to the floor. The Senator from Wyoming was talking about President Clinton's shorts and T-shirts. And then I had to listen to this distorted babble about a 2-for-1 ratio and \$2.82 in taxes to each \$1 in cuts.

Here is the budget. Its deficit reduction is accomplished through all kinds of spending cuts and freezes. The opposition cries, "Cut first, cut-cut, tax and spend." I want to tell you who has been spending. The Republicans are howling because they know we have cut spending. Defense, domestic, international affairs in 1993: \$548 billion; in President Clinton's budget, 1994: \$538 billion.

So what did President Clinton do? He came to town and he said, "Look, I am going to cut my own White House staff 25 percent." He said, "I am going to cut out 100,000 Federal employees." Cut spending first? He has been the first one to cut.

They do not like a President who cuts the deficit. They have had two Presidents for 12 years whose solemn oath was to increase the deficit and debt, and they succeeded.

But President Clinton said first, when he came to town, "I will cut the White House. We will cut 100,000 employees. We will cut your pay, Mr. President, and cut my pay, and all Federal pay. There is going to be a freeze. We are going to cut the congressional staffs." I had to cut staff in the Commerce, Space, Science, Transportation Committee by 10 percent.

Next, the President put the Vice President in charge of auditing all the executive departments to see where he can root out waste. And he put his brilliant wife, Ms. Hillary Rodham Clinton, in charge of cutting health costs.

This administration has been working now for 6 months on cutting spending first. So the Senators from Washington, Oklahoma, and Wyoming are Johnny come lately's when they cry "Cut spending first." And the Senator from Oklahoma is flat wrong in claiming that this plan has \$2.82 in taxes for each \$1 in cuts, nonsense.

In truth the President's plan actually has more spending cuts than new taxes. I am going to give you the exact figures. The President cuts spending first, and those cuts are as follows: Entitlements, \$97 billion in cuts; discretionary, \$102 billion in cuts; interest costs, \$56 billion in cuts; for a total of \$255 billion in spending cuts.

The new revenues total \$243 billion. So my friends on the other side can run around with their bogus claims, they can babble on about the President's shorts and the First Lady's taxes or whatever, but they ought to be ashamed of themselves, trotting out here for an hour every week, trying to divert the public's attention, but offering no constructive, detailed recommendation whatsoever.

I sat in that Budget Committee, and all the opposition did was play games. When they got to the Budget Committee, they said, "The President is cutting everybody's pay. We can't have that." So they voted for amendments to increase the pay. Later, they came to the floor with the Dole-Domenici plan, which included all the cuts proposed by the Democrats. It was Democrats who cut spending first. The Republicans simply took the Democratic cuts in their Dole-Domenici plan.

So they are just playing a sordid game of hollow amendments, bogus alternatives, and nothing constructive. They took our cuts, and added to them a 5-year freeze—never mind the flood in the Midwest—costing \$8 billion, \$9 billion; and never mind practical considerations such as paying for an expansion of prisons and law enforcement.

I am wrestling now with an appropriations bill trying to find an additional \$130 million for immigration, Border Patrol, to get on top of that; for internal security so terrorists will not be blowing up the World Trade Center and other landmarks; for Somalia, for Bosnia, for all the peacekeeping operations that have gone up to a billion bucks.

So they preached grandly: "We are going to have a 5-year freeze." It was just fabricated out of the whole cloth. Nothing in the Finance Committee; no motion, just, by gosh, a full-court press on TV on the floor of the U.S. Senate hollering "cut spending first" and just a babble of tax, tax, tax.

All right, if they want to talk taxes, let us talk about their taxes. They do not want to talk about really reducing the deficit and the debt. They want to talk about taxes. Let us talk about their tax of \$1 billion a day. That is what we have to go down and borrow everyday, \$1 billion to pay interest costs on the national debt. When the

Republicans came to town in 1981, annual interest costs were \$52 billion. Today, annual interest is \$310 billion. So every weekday and Saturday we go down to the bank at 8 o'clock and increase taxes by \$1 billion, and therein, Mr. President, is the real problem that very few in the land have realized because we have failed to educate the American people.

There was a little program that my kids listened to early every Saturday morning, "Big John and Sparky." It used to repeat this rhyme: "All the way through life, let this be your goal: Keep your eye on the donut, not the hole." The donut in this case is the \$1 billion-per-day interest costs or the interest "taxes." You can pay Social Security taxes and you get Social Security benefits. You can pay gasoline taxes and you can get highways and bridges. But pay \$1 billion-per-day interest "taxes" and you get absolutely nothing.

The Republican crowd that was going to do away with waste instituted the biggest scandal of waste in the history of man. And responsibility for this scandal is now admitted to by the very architect of the Reagan economic plan, David Stockman. Writing in *New Perspective* magazine, none other than David Stockman, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget for President Ronald Reagan, clearly lays the blame in the Republicans' lap. I ask unanimous consent to print the article in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From *New Perspective*, Spring 1993]

AMERICA IS NOT OVERSPENDING

(David A. Stockman, Director of the Office of Management and Budget from 1981 to 1985, during the first years of the "Reagan Revolution." David Stockman left office amid the lingering controversy caused by his revelation in the Atlantic magazine about the internal Administration politics which, Stockman said, would result in untenable deficits.)

(Stockman's memoirs of those years are entitled "A Triumph of Politics: How the Reagan Revolution Failed." He is currently a General Partner at the Blackstone Group, a New York investment house.)

President Clinton's economic plan deserves heavy-duty criticism—particularly the \$190 billion worth of new boondoggles through FY 1998 that are euphemistically labelled "stimulus" and "investment" programs. But on one thing he has told the unvarnished truth. There is no way out of the elephantine budget deficits which have plagued the nation since 1981 without major tax increases.

In this regard, the full-throated anti-tax war cries emanating from the GPO since February 17 amount to no more than deceptive gibberish. Indeed, if Congressman Newt Gingrich and his playmates had the parental supervision they deserve, they would be sent to the nearest corner wherein the lodge their Pinocchio-sized noses until this adult task of raising taxes is finished.

The fact is, we have no other viable choice. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) forecast, by FY 1998 we will have practical full employment and, also, nearly a \$400 billion budget deficit if nothing is done. The projected red ink would amount to five percent of GNP, and would mean continuing

Treasury absorption of most of our meager net national savings through the end of the century. This is hardly a formula for sustaining a competitive and growing economy.

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax-cutting that shattered the nation's fiscal stability. A noisy faction of Republicans have willfully denied this giant mistake of fiscal governance, and their own culpability in it, ever since. Instead, they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with a mindless stream of anti-tax venom, while pretending that economic growth and spending cuts alone could cure the deficit.

It ought to be obvious by now that we can't grow our way out. If we should happen to realize CBO's economic forecast by 1998, wouldn't a nearly \$400 billion deficit in a full employment economy 17 years after the event finally constitute the smoking gun?

To be sure, a version to higher taxes is usually a necessary, healthy impulse in a political democracy. But when the alternative becomes as self-evidently threadbare and groundless as has the "growth" argument, we are no longer dealing with legitimate skepticism but with what amounts to a demagogic fetish.

Unfortunately, as a matter of hard-core political realism, the ritualized spending cut mantra of the GPO anti-taxers is equally vapid. Again, the historical facts are overwhelming.

Ronald Reagan's original across-the-board income tax cut would have permanently reduced the federal revenue base by three percent of GNP. At a time when defense spending was being rapidly pumped up, and in a context in which the then "conservative" congressional majority had already decided to leave 90 percent of domestic spending untouched, the Reagan tax rate cut along would have strained the nation's fiscal equation beyond the breaking point. But no one blew the whistle. Instead, both parties succumbed to a shameless tax-bidding war that ended up doubling the tax cut to six percent of GNP—or slashing by nearly one-third the permanent revenue base of the United States government.

While delayed effective dates and phase-ins postponed the full day of reckoning until the late 1980s, there is no gainsaying the fiscal carnage. As of August, 1981, Uncle Sam had been left to finance a 1980s-sized domestic welfare and state and defense build-up from a general revenue base that was now smaller relative to GNP than at any time since 1940!

In subsequent years, several "mini" tax increase bills did slowly restore the Federal revenue base to nearly its post-war average share of GNP. The \$2.5 trillion in cumulative deficits since 1981, however, is not a product of "over-spending" in any meaningful sense of the term. In fact, we have had a rolling legislative referendum for 12 years on "appropriate" Federal spending in today's society—and by now the overwhelming bipartisan consensus is crystal clear.

Cash benefits for Social Security recipients, government retirees and veterans will cost about \$500 billion in 1998—or six percent of prospective GNP. The fact is they also cost six percent of GNP when Jimmy Carter came to town in 1977, as they did when Ronald Reagan arrived in 1981, Bush in 1989 and Clinton in 1993.

The explanation for this remarkable 25 years of actual and prospective fiscal cost stability is simple. Since the mid-1970s there has been no legislative action to increase benefits, while a deep political consensus has steadily congealed on not cutting them, either. Ronald Reagan pledged not to touch Social Security in his 1984 debate with Mondale; on this issue Bush never did move his lips; and Rep. Gingrich can readily wax elo-

quently on the "sanctity" of the nation's social contract with the old folks as the late Senator Claude Pepper ever did.

The political and policy fundamentals of the \$375 billion prospective 1998 cost of Medicare and Medicaid are exactly the same. If every amendment relating to these medical entitlements which increased or decreased eligibility and benefit coverage since Jimmy Carter's inauguration were laid end-to-end, the net impact by 1998 would hardly amount to one or two percent of currently projected costs.

Thus, in the case of the big medical entitlements, there has been no legislatively driven "overspending" surge in the last two decades. And since 1981, no elected Republican has even dared think out loud about the kind of big changes in beneficiary premium costs and co-payments that could actually save meaningful budget dollars.

To be sure, budget costs of the medical entitlements have skyrocketed—but that is because our underlying health delivery system is ridden with inflationary growth. Perhaps Hillary will fix this huge, systemic economic problem. But until that silver bullet is discovered, there is no way to save meaningful budget dollars in these programs except to impose higher participation costs on middle and upper income beneficiaries—a move for which the GOP has absolutely no stomach.

Likewise, the "safety net" for the poor and price and credit supports for rural America cost the same in real terms—about \$100 billion—as they did in January, 1981. That is because Republicans and Democrats have gone to the well year after year only to add nickels, subtract pennies, and, in effect, validate over and over the same "appropriate" level of spending.

On the vast expanse of the domestic budget, then, "overspending" is an absolute myth. Our post-1981 mega-deficits are not attributable to it; and the GOP has neither a coherent program nor the political courage to attack anything but the most microscopic spending marginalia.

It is unfortunate that having summoned the courage to face the tax issue squarely, President Clinton has clouded the debate with an excess of bashing the wealthy and an utterly unnecessary grab-bag of new tax and spending giveaways. But that can be corrected in the legislative process—and it in no way lets the Republicans off the hook. They led the Congress into a giant fiscal mistake 12 years ago, and they now have the responsibility to work with a President who is at least brave enough to attempt to correct it.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I quote from David Stockman:

In this regard, the full-throated antitax war cries emanating from the GOP since February 17 amount to no more than deceptive gibberish.

I will read that again. This is David Stockman:

In this regard, the full-throated antitax war cries emanating from the GOP since February 17 amount to no more than deceptive gibberish.

Bear in mind that Stockman is the architect of this fiscal dilemma that Republicans have offloaded on a President, President Clinton, who is willing to work, is willing to commit, willing to lead. I saw President Clinton last night on Larry King Live. He was magnificent. We, Democrats, are worried now because they have us on a tax run, because we were suckered into this nonsense. But listen to David Stockman to get a true picture of who got us

into this mess and what is required to get us out of it.

I am quoting Stockman:

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax cutting that shattered the Nation's fiscal stability.

I want to read that again:

The root problem goes back to the July 1981 frenzy of excessive and imprudent tax cutting that shattered the Nation's fiscal stability. A noisy faction of Republicans have willfully denied this giant mistake of fiscal governance, and their own culpability in it, ever since. Instead, they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with a mindless stream of antitax venom, while pretending that economic growth and spending cuts alone could cure the deficit.

It ought to be obvious by now that we can't grow our way out of.

I am skipping over, and one more line here:

On the vast expanse of the domestic budget, then, "overspending" is an absolute myth. Our post-1981 mega-deficits are not attributable to it; and the GOP has neither a coherent program nor the political courage to attack anything but the most microscopic spending marginalia.

And among those marginalia, I would include the President's BVD's, which we had to hear about this morning from the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Now what have we come to as a governing body? The opposition does not offer a single constructive program. Stockman knows it. We know it. They know it. And that is why they constantly resort to this verbal abuse and posturing on taxes. I quote Stockman one more time:

Instead they have incessantly poisoned the political debate with a mindless stream of antitax venom.

That is what we have heard. That is exactly what it is. I cannot sit in my office and listen to this nonsense every week and act like seriously I am a Senator of the United States trying to work on the problems.

You find the President coming here and is willing not to finesse and fiddle around, but to attack the deficit from every angle. A freeze? Yes, I authored that, and tried, along with Howard Baker, for 5 years. President Clinton has offered better than a freeze. When you have \$548 billion in this for domestic discretionary, for defense, and for international—all three—and you are cutting it back, that is more ambitious than a freeze. That is not just taking the \$548 billion for 1993 and duplicating it next year. We are cutting \$10 billion out of that. We have cut spending first. And we still need, as Stockman and everyone else with any common sense knows—and they know it and they do have common sense—you are going to need some taxes.

I had to listen to the Social Security nonsense. Everybody that has a pension, other than Social Security, pays taxes on 100 percent of benefits. So it has been recommended in trying to get some kind of fiscal prudence around here that we take couples who are

making over \$40,000, rather than paying on 50 percent, let them pay on 85 percent. Not on 100 percent, like every other pension beneficiary is paying, but let them pay on 85 percent. That is strictly on the rich. That is not ruining Social Security.

What they voted against—a majority—was an increase in Social Security taxes. We got under the Clinton bill a program of raising taxes on the wealthiest recipients of Social Security—who, bless them, have worked their way out and do not, in a sense, need Social Security as was originally intended, as a safety net. To tell you the truth, I have talked to many, many of them visiting around the country and they agree that benefits of the wealthy should be taxed.

This crowd is trying to intimidate, terrorize, poison the well, as Stockman says, about Social Security.

Senator MOYNIHAN and I gave them a chance to vote against increasing Social Security taxes in April 1991. But they all said do not mess with Social Security. In fact, we were trying to stop the messing with Social Security. There was an automatic, by law, increase in January of over \$5.4 billion in Social Security taxes—factored out, over some \$30 billion over the 5 years. Republicans voted for that tax increase of over \$30 some billion but have the audacity and unmitigated gall now to come on the floor and oppose the \$28 billion tax increase for the wealthiest taxpayers over 5 years that can help us get rid of this cancer that they left on Bill Clinton's doorstep.

The problem then is not just the deficit. The problem is the tax increase of daily interest payments that are on automatic pilot. I call it the Reagan-Bush automatic pilot. They put tax increases to the tune of \$1 billion a day. That is our problem. Because if you take the entire Clinton plan, and you look at the end of 5 years, you still have a more than substantial deficit. You see, we confuse things when we talk about reducing the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years. What we mean is we are reducing deficit spending by \$500 billion. Because the problem is so vicious and self-perpetuating that we will be increasing the national debt by way of ongoing deficit spending. Deficit and debt, debt and deficit, the same thing. Up and up and away. It has to be paid for, which increases the interest cost, interest taxes that are going up each year.

So what we are doing is trying to get on top of this tax hemorrhage. If they want to talk taxes, I am going to talk taxes the rest of this year. And they are the ones who created this mess over 12 years. They had the entire Government practically speaking with the President and his vetoes. He was always threatening. George Bush never threatened a veto on spending. I can go back to the Reagan record, all the spending bills he signed. Not a single veto of spending by George Herbert Walker Bush. At least they are no

longer talking over there about the Bush recovery, for heavens sakes. We do not have a strong recovery. It is a very, very tenuous thing. Because of what? Because of the quadrupling of the national debt under Reagan and Bush. Because the debt was right at \$903 billion when President Reagan came to town. Now it is \$4.2 trillion. We never reached a \$1 trillion debt in the 207 years of history, with all the Presidents, in the history of our land, prior to Reagan. But when Reagan came on board, he instituted an affirmative action program to increase the deficit and increase the debt, and now the Republicans have off-loaded it onto President Clinton.

The real problem is how can we keep the Government viable and solvent. We want to try to get on top of Head Start, Women, Infants, and Children's feeding, the FBI, the Border Patrol, the flood in the Midwest, Hurricane Andrew, antiterrorism, the cost of peacekeeping, and so on. How do we pay for it?

They say cut spending first. I am going to try to mark up an appropriations bill this afternoon. The first task I face is to cut \$1.2 billion to get within the President's budget. So when the distinguished Attorney General Reno came the first question I asked her was, "Madam Attorney General, where is \$130 million that you want cut. Do not tell me what you want to increase. You and I have to find the cuts."

When Secretary Brown of Commerce came, I said, "Mr. Secretary, \$537 million you and I have to cut." And we cut \$10 billion out of current programs—as they say, cut spending first. I would like to cut more—the super collider, the space station, the Osprey, \$2 billion out of intelligence could easily be saved, the satellite program. I can go on. The Republicans are the ones who continually vote for these unnecessary programs. Yes, we can cut spending more, but do not blame President Clinton for not cutting spending first. He has been leading the way, and they do not like it. They do not have a plan, and they want to act like taxes are the plan. Yes, their taxes. The Reagan-Bush taxes are \$310 billion, meaning every weekday and Saturday at 8 o'clock, every morning as a result of the Reagan-Bush administrations and their programs with all they had for 6 years, the Republican Senate and everything else—and they are the ones who started it. Ask Stockman. He said it started under their leadership, their President, their Senate. Now they try to cover up by generating this incessant babble about taxes. "A mindless stream of antitax venom" is what David Stockman calls it or, rather, deceptive gibberish. That is what we have. I hope they will cut it out and let us go to work and try to solve the Nation's problem and quite engaging in this pollster politics.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, what is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator the period for morning business is set to expire at 12:45.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed in morning business not to exceed 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

INCREASED SPENDING BY PRESIDENTS

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from South Carolina who has eloquently, as usual, pointed out historically just how ludicrous the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle has been with the spending under the Bush and Reagan administrations. It is really appalling to see the politicization that has changed in this body just by the fact that there is a Democrat at the White House. We saw the biggest spending, and you cannot blame it on Congress, you have to lay it right at the feet of the President of the United States, whoever that may be, he or she. And if in fact spending increases under this administration, it will be the Clinton administration that increased it, just as it was the Bush administration and the Reagan administration that increased spending.

Yes, the Congress does approve those funds. We understand that. But the leadership comes from the White House, and we have some leadership here. I did not vote for the Reconciliation Act because of tax problems that I felt were not necessary. But, indeed, there are cuts there, more cuts than we have seen ever offered, at least in the 17 years I have been in this body. The Senator from South Carolina certainly points that out very explicitly.

MFN TO ROMANIA

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, on July 13, 1993, legislation was introduced in the Congress to restore most-favored-nation status to Romania. As chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, known as the Helsinki Commission, this is an issue I have followed closely for some time and one about which I have expressed serious reservations in the past. That is why I feel it especially important to comment on it today, and I do support the restoration of MFN to Romania.

As many of my colleagues will recall, last year I joined Senator BYRD and a bipartisan group of my colleagues in cosponsoring an amendment to delay consideration of MFN until Romania's Presidential and parliamentary elections had taken place. Our amendment also noted that in considering the trade agreement, the Senate would take into account Romania's record on human rights and its compliance with

the United Nations sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro.

Because of the Helsinki Commission's concerns regarding the free and fair conduct of the electoral process, Cochairman STENY HOYER and I sent a member of the Commission staff to Romania both during the campaign period and on election day. In our view, the September 1992 elections legitimately reflected the will of the people of Romania.

Since that time, we have continued to monitor closely developments in Romania. In April 1993, I led a Helsinki Commission delegation to Romania, with the express purpose of focusing on issues of congressional concern: independence of the media, civilian control of the security forces, and protection of human rights. Our delegation discussed these issues in detail with Romanian human rights and civic organizations, media representatives, Parliamentarians, and President Ion Iliescu. We also participated in a ceremony commemorating the transfer of six United States speedboats to the Romania and Bulgarian customs authorities for assistance in sanctions enforcement.

Our delegation was impressed by many of the changes that were visible since our last visit in 1990, from the growing number of commercial enterprises in Bucharest to the energy and organization of the nongovernmental human rights community and the ambitious motivation of independent media representatives.

I firmly believe that the time has come to demonstrate our support and encouragement for the efforts the people of Romania continue to make to build and strengthen democracy in their country. Of course, the transition is still underway, and the Helsinki Commission will continue to monitor developments closely. But we need to acknowledge that important steps have been taken, from establishing a joint parliamentary commission to oversee the Romanian Intelligence Service to auctioning frequencies for local independent television stations to forming, with full government support, a Consultative Council for National Minorities. And we need to recognize that Romania is making a good-faith effort to enforce the U.N. sanctions against a former ally and trading partner, despite tremendous economic difficulty at home.

The Helsinki Commission naturally hopes that further progress toward full compliance with CSCE standards and commitments will be achieved. But clearly, important efforts are underway, and the Romanians deserve our support. If we truly care about developments in Romania, then our policy must be one of engagement, and not isolation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the restoration of most-favored-nation trade status to Romania.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

FOUR VALIANT LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS DIED

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I come to the floor today. I regret to inform my colleagues of the deaths of three U.S. customs officers and one officer from the Georgia Bureau of Investigation. These four valiant law enforcement officers died in the service of their country while protecting their community and our Nation—customs officers David E. DeLoach, air interdiction officer; Alan J. Klumpp, pilot; Carl "Richard" Talafous, pilot; and Lee DeLoach, Georgia Bureau of Investigation—no relation to David E. DeLoach—were killed in the crash of a U.S. Customs helicopter on Wednesday, July 14, 1993.

Mere words cannot express my sorrow over this loss. There is no doubt in my mind and there should be no doubt in this Chamber that these dedicated men made the ultimate sacrifice in the pursuit of freedom from the illicit drug trade. We owe the preservation of our fundamental freedoms to the brave few who put their lives on the line, to protect us, and to protect our children.

When one of your own is taken in the line of duty it brings close to home what the family and friends of law enforcement officers live with every day—that the next day may be their last. It is hard to imagine the pain and suffering that has come to the families of these Customs officers. I would hope that we would take a moment to reflect on the courage and the spirit of Messrs. Klumpp, DeLoach, Talafous, and DeLoach.

I have met with a good number of customs aviation operations employees, and I have found an extraordinary esprit de corps. This experience gave me the insight to know that commitment to law enforcement and the love of flying were with these individuals to the end.

Mr. President, the parents, family, friends, and all of the people close to these brave men, must know in their hearts that they have the thanks and the support of a grateful nation. The families must know that these men and the hundreds like them who carry a badge, do so with our respect and our praise. We should help David DeLoach's 2-year-old son to understand that his dad was on a mission to make his and other children's world a little safer. There is no higher calling.

No words, actions, or deeds can bring these brothers, sons, father, uncles, friends back to us. We should, however, always remember their contribution to this Nation's security. They died with honor and respect, just as they served. Mr. President, I would simply ask that we observe a moment of silence to remember our fallen.

FLOODING IN THE MIDWEST

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I had an opportunity to visit with a few of the folks affected by the devastating floods

in the Midwest. I am not amazed at the steel of these people, the ability to come back from a very catastrophic flood. I can remember the floods of 1951 when the water got to the second floor of the exchange building at the stockyards in Kansas City.

I can remember other floods. It is just remarkable, the resiliency of the core of this country, the heart of this country, the ability to deal with this catastrophic flood and do it with an attitude and resignation that, yes, this is mother nature acting up again; we are survivors; we will survive this, and the next generation will also. But we must help those people in some way.

But I will tell you, they are really brave, brave souls who are fighting the elements now in the central part of this great Nation. I congratulate them for it, and I am with them.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO PAT NIXON

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, recently, our Nation lost a person I believe served us all as an uncommon First Lady. Pat Nixon never sought the public spotlight, and in fact, she never cared a great deal for political life, but she brought to the White House a special dignity and a quiet determination that only now seems to be gaining an appreciation.

News stories since her death have talked about her support for equal rights for women and for the appointment of a woman to the Supreme Court. We also now recognize her efforts not only to restore the historical authenticity of the White House but to open its doors to more of the American people.

I never had the pleasure of meeting Mrs. Nixon, but I have long admired her. In part, that is because of my own family history as the daughter of a man strongly devoted to politics and public service. Like Pat Nixon, my mother was never enamored of politics, but she cared deeply about my father and our family and her priorities were never in question.

Pat Nixon's priorities also were never in question. The news media and much of the public seems to have never understood that she was not pretending to be a faithful wife and a good mother. That is simply who she was and what she was. For the Nixon family, she was the human bridge between the never-ending demands of public life and the need each of us feels for a place that is genuinely, and simply, home.

Somehow, I am not surprised to hear now that Pat Nixon had superb political instincts or that she played a role in White House matters. He obvious intelligence and substance always suggested that. But the titles she prized most highly were those of wife, mother, and homemaker. With a lifetime spent in the glare of the public spotlight, holding to those priorities was no small achievement. We honor her for that.